

could go to the CIR, or the Commission of Industrial Relations to resolve those disputes as is the case with the local government employees currently. Currently, because of Supreme Court decisions, it is clear that the state employees do have that right. The bill does not take away that right. But there is language in the bill which would delay the possibility of going to the CIR for the '86-87 fiscal year, and in addition is drafted the '87-88 fiscal year. The reason for that is simply to provide the opportunity for legislation to be considered and enacted, in the 1987 session, to put into statute the structure which is for the processing of negotiations and the CIR orders, which currently does not exist as far as state employees bargaining units are concerned. So what the bill does, in Section 1, it's a statement of legislative intent. The two year moratorium on wages as established in the bill is for the purpose of giving the state to try to work out a method for meaningful collective bargaining for state employees. The section also establishes legislative recognition of the Supreme Court case giving state employees the right to bargain wages, and the CIR jurisdiction to determine wage cases based on comparability. Section 2 removes from the CIR jurisdiction over salaries of state employees, as I've indicated, for current fiscal year for which we are appropriating, '86-87, and in addition '87-88, and establishes the salaries for those years as set by the bill. It also specifies that '86-87 appropriations cannot be used to pay for any order by the Commission of Industrial Relations for '86-87. It also, in Section 2, would remove employees university and the state colleges from jurisdiction for the same time frame of '86-87, '87-88, and it is a separate action...it is a separate section that the Legislature cannot set salary policy for these agencies, but on the jurisdiction of the court or rather the Commission of Industrial Relations. The reason that those two entities were included is that there was a question of equity, I guess, that if a delay or a deferral while we were developing a process for two years, or one year actually, for next session, that it was appropriate, probably, that it would be uniformly applied not only to state employees that are not in higher education, but those in higher education as well. Then the bill also specifies that the restrictions on the CIR jurisdiction applies to all cases filed with the CIR in '86, '87, '88, '89. And the intent of this provisions is to insure that any cases pending would fall under the bill. Then there is an emergency clause. Now we